

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03753 01 OF 03 151723Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 ERDE-00 /083 W
----- 062674

O R 151545Z JUL 75 ZFF-4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2714

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 3753

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JULY 14

REFS: (A) USNATO 3614 DTG 071850Z JUL 75

(B) STATE 161503

(C) USNATO 3560 DTG 031310Z JUL 75

SUMMARY: SPC ON JULY 14 CONTINUED WORK ON PARAS 1 AND 3 OF DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG. RE PARA 1, FRG STILL HAD NO POSITION ON "MIGHT" VS "WOULD", I.E. THE LANGUAGE WHICH WOULD DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE ALLIES GO FOR A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I. HOWEVER FRG REP GAVE GURTHER EVIDENCE OF TRANSITION IN FRG POSITION BY SUGGESTING FLEXIBILITY ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING AT THIS TIME IN LIGHT OF DATA AND DEFINITION DISCUSSION IN VIENNA. DUTCH PROPOSED DELETING THE PHRASES ON REQUIRING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO ALLIED GOALS AND ON THE "ADD-ON" RATIONALE. THIS PROPOSAL HAD NO SUPPORT. PARA 1 IS NOW IN REASONABLY GOOD SHAPE, STATING CLEARLY THE CHOICES RE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03753 01 OF 03 151723Z

FIXING OF A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING. NEXT STEP ON THIS ISSUE MUST AWAIT FRG DECISION ON ITS POSITION. RE PARA 3, FRG OPPOSED THE DRAFT WHICH HAD EMERGED FROM JULY 7 MEETING, AND OPPOSED EVEN MORE THE US AMENDMENT TO THAT VERSION OF PARA 3,

ON GROUNDS THAT IT CREATED AN UNACCEPTABLE PARELLELISM BETWEEN ALLIED AND WP CONCERNS. (BELGIAN, CANADIAN, UK AND ITALIAN REPS AGREED WITH HIM ON LATTER SCORE, WHILE NETHERLANDS SUPPORTED US AMENDMENT.) FRG REP REINTRODUCED THE BELGIAN "PLUS" PARAGRAPH OF JULY 2 (WHICH STATED THAT NO OTHER OFFER OF EQUIPMENT COULD BE HOPED FOR IN PHASE I OR PHASE II, WHICH BELGIUM HAD AGREED TO DROP AT JULY 7 MEETING. US, BELGIUM, CANADA AND NETHERLANDS OPPOSED LATTER CHANGE. RESULT OF MEETING RE PARA 3 WAS FOUR ALTERNATIVE ENDINGS: THE ENDING IN THE JULY 7 SPC DRAFT, THE US AND FRG VERSIONS, AND A BELGIAN ATTAMPT AT COMPROMISE. OUR COMMENT FOLLOWS AT END OF THIS MESSAGE. END SUMMARY

1. THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH REFERENCES ARE TO THE JULY 7 TEXT OF THE SPC DRAFT GUIDANCE AS CONTAINED IN REF A:

2. PARA 1, FIRST SENTENCE. CHANGE "OUTCOME OF REDUCTIONS IN A SECOND PHASE" TO "OGAL OF THE NEGOTIATION TO BE REACHED IN PHASE II". THIS CHANGE WAS SUGGESTED BY FRG REP (HOYNCK) AND ACCEPTED BY SPC AD REFERENDUM.

3. THROUGHOUT PARA 1, CHANGE "COMMON CEILING" TO "COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING". THIS WAS ALSO SUGGESTED BY FRG REP AND ACCEPTED BY SPC.

4. PARA 1, FIRST TIC. DELETE "OF APPROXIMATE PARITY" AND INSERT AFTER "NEGOTIATIONS": "OF APPROXIMATE PARITY IN GROUND FORCES". THIS WAS SUGGESTED BY BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) AND ACCEPTED BY SPC.

5. PARA 1, FIRST TIC: "MIGHT" VS "WOULD". UK REP (SINTON) SAID UK COULD NOW ACCEPT "MIGHT" IN THIS PARAGRAPH (THUS AGREEING WITH US), SINCE THIS IS FACTUAL STATEMENT OF PRESENT ALLIED POSITION. HOWEVER, UK STILL WANTS "WOULD" IN THE LAST TIC OF PARA 1. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA) SAID NETHERLANDS STILL WANTS "WOULD" IN THE FIRST TIC, BUT HE WOULD TRY TO CONVINCE HIS AUTHORITIES TO ACCEPT "MIGHT".

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03753 01 OF 03 151723Z

6. PARA 1, INTRODUCTORY SENTENCE TO LAST TWO TICS: FRG REP PROPOSED REPLACING "PROVIDED" BY "ON CONDITION THAT", AND THIS WAS GENERALLY ACCEPTED BY SPC. HOWEVER, NETHERLANDS REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WISHED TO DELETE THE WHOLE PHRASE: "PROVIDED ALL THESE GOALS ARE AGREED IN PHASE I OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, THAT", AND ALSO WISHED TO DELETE IN THE NEXT TIC: "AS A SPECIAL ADD-ON TO THE WESTERN REDUCTION CONTRIBUTION". HE SAID THAT THE DUTCH REASONS FOR THESE DELETIONS WERE PURELY PRESENTATION, I.E. IT WOULD GET THE OFFER OFF TO A BETTER START NOT TO USE SUCH CATEGORICAL LANGUAGE. BELGIUM, FRG AND ITALIAN (SPINELLI) REPS OPPOSED THE DUTCH PROPOSAL ON GROUNDS THAT THE ALLIES HAD TO MAKE CLEAR FROM THE OUTSET THAT THIS WAS A LIMITED, CONDITIONAL OFFER, CONSTITUTING AN "ADD-ON" TO THE PRESENT ALLIED PROPOSAL.

UK REP SAID HE THOUGHT HIS AUTHORITIES COULD AGREE TO THE SECOND DUTCH DELETION, SINCE THEY PREFERRED THE "UNIQUE OFFER" RATIONALE IMPLICIT IN PARA 3 OF THE GUIDANCE. THE TWO PHRASES WHICH THE DUTCH WANT DELETED THUS GO INTO BRACKETS. OTHER CHANGES IN THIS TIC ARE AS FOLLOWS: AFTER "WITHDRAW" INSERT "INPHASE I"; AND AFTER "CONTRIBUTION" INSERT "IN BOTH PHASES". THESE WERE BELGIAN SUGGESTIONS, GENERALLY ACCEPTED BY SPC. AFTER "1,000" INSERT "US", PER US REQUEST.

7. PARA 1, LAST TIC. FRG REP STILL DID NOT HAVE A POSITION REGARDING "MIGHT" VS "WOULD". HE SAID HE WISHED TO INTRODUCE THE IDEA THAT THERE WOULD BE SOME ADVANTAGE IN THE ALLIES MAINTAINING THEIR FLEXIBILITY ON THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING. AS THE FIRST PHASE NEGOTIATIONS PROGRESS, WE WILL GAIN A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF OUR OWN AND EASTERN DATA. IT THEREFORE MAY BE WISE TO KEEP OPEN THE QUESTION OF THE SETTING OF THE COMMON CEILING, AND COME BACK TO IT LATER IN PHASE I. BELGIAN REP SAID HE AGREED WITH FRG REP. HE THOUGHT THAT GIVEN THE COURSE OF THE REDEFINITION DISCUSSION IN VIENNA, THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO MAINTAIN SUPPLENESS, BEFORE PROPOSING A SPECIFIC FIGURE FOR THE COMMON CEILING.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03753 02 OF 03 151735Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 ERDE-00 /083 W

----- 062861

O R 151545Z JUL 75 ZFF-4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2715

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 3753

8. PARA 3. THE SPC AGREES ON THE PRESENT TEXT FOR PARA 3 UP TO THE SENTENCE BEGINNING "THEY SHOULD ALSO STATE THAT".

9. US REP (PEREZ) INTRODUCED THE AMENDMENT FOLLOWING "THEY

SHOULD ALSO STATE THAT" CONTAINED IN PARA 4, REF B. IN INTRO-DUCING IT, HE POINTED OUT THAT IT BUILDS ON THE SPC JULY 7 DRAFT, AND DOES NOT SIGNIFICANTLY MODIFY IT, EXCEPT TO BRING OUT A LITTLE MORE CLEARLY THE RATIONALE CONTAINED IN THAT DRAFT.

10. FRG REP INTRODUCED THE FOLLOWING AS A REPLACEMENT FOR THE PART OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE BEGINNING "THEY SHOULD ALSO STATE THAT":

11. BEGIN FRG TEXT:

THEY SHOULD STATE THAT THE ALLIES MAINTAIN THEIR POSITION THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD FOCUS ON REDUCTIONS TO BE MADE IN THE PERSONNEL OF THE GROUND FORCES WHICH CONSTITUTE THE LARGEST AND MOST SIGNIFICANT MILITARY ELEMENT IN THE AREA OF
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03753 02 OF 03 151735Z

REDUCTIONS AND THAT THE EXISTING DISPARITIES IN MAIN BATTLE TANKS SHOULD BE REDUCED. THEY SHOULD EMPHASIZE THAT THE NEW ALLIED MOVE WHILE TAKING, INTO ACCOUNT CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY THE EASTERN SIDE ABOUT NUCLEAR AND AIR ELEMENTS WOULD CONSTITUTE A UNIQUE OFFER AND IS NOT BEING PUT FORWARD AS A STEP TOWARD FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR OR AIRFORCES OR IN EQUIPMENT. THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS, IF AND WHEN PRESSED, SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR TO THE EASTERN SIDE THAT THIS OFFER IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS FINAL, IN THE SENSE THAT NO OTHER OFFER FOR THE REDUCTION OF ANY EQUIPMENT OF ANY KIND CAN BE HOPED FOR IN EITHER PHASE I OR PHASE II FROM EITHER THE UNITED STATES OR ANY OTHER WESTERN PARTICIPANT.

END FRG TEXT.

12. FRG REP SAID THAT BONN DID NOT LIKE THE WAY THE DRAFT GUIDANCE RESULTING FROM JULY 7 SPC MEETING REFERRED TO EASTERN CONCERNS, SINCE THIS WOULD GIVE THE OTHER SIDE AN EASY OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE ITS OTHER CONCERNS, AND PRESS FOR INCLUSION OF MORE ELEMENTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE FRG DOES NOT WANT TO BE DRAWN INTO A "TRADE" OF THE SORT MENTIONED IN THE JULY 7 DRAFT GUIDANCE. THEFRG WISHES TO MAKE CLEAR THAT ALLIED FOCUS REMAINS ON GROUND FORCES, WHICH WAS NOT CLEAR FROM THE FIFTH SENTENCE OF THE PRESENT DRAFT. THE FRG, IN ITS AMENDMENT, IS WILLING TO REFER TO EASTERN CONCERNS, SINCE THE AMENDMENT DROPS REFERENCE TO A TRADE, AND UNDERLINES THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF THE OFFER. FRG REP AID HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD FIND THE PROPOSED US AMENDMENT EVEN LESS ACCEPTABLE THAN THE JULY 7 DRAFT GUIDANCE, BECAUSE THE US PUTS WP CONCERNS ON THE SAME LEVEL AS ALLIED CONCERNS, AND CREATES THE KIND OF PARALLELISM WHICH F RG HAS SOUGHT TO AVOID.

13. US REP STATED THERE WAS NO IMPLICATION IN THE US AMENDMENT THAT WP CONCERNS AND ALLIED CONCERNS WERE OF EQUAL VALIDITY. THE WP CONCERNS ARE "EXPRESSED"CONCERNS", AS THE US AMENDMENT MAKES CLEAR. HE NOTED THAT THIS US AMENDMENT DID NOT

CONSTITUTE A MAJOR DEPARTURE FROM THE TEXT WHICH CAME OUT
OF THE JULY 7 MEETING. THE US AMENDMENT BRINGS
OUT THE EXPRESSED CONCERNS OF BOTH SIDES IN A WAY WHICH WOULD
HELP THE ALLIES DRAW A LINE AGAINST FURTHER EASTERN PRESSURES
FOR EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS. HE OBSERVED THAT THE FIRST
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03753 02 OF 03 151735Z

SENTENCE OF THE FRG AMENDMENT WAS ALMOST IDENTICAL WITH THE
SENTENCE THE FRG HAD PROPOSED IN THE SAME CONTEXT ON
JULY 2. (PARA 2, REF C).

14. BELGIAN REP SAID BELGIUM CONTINUES TO OPPOSE ANY
PARALLELISM OF THE SORT IN THE US AMENDMENT. CANADIAN
(BARTLEMAN), UK, AND ITALIAN REPS AGREED. NETHERLANDS REP
SUPPORTED THE US AMENDMENT.

15. IN VIEW OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE US AMENDMENT
AND THE FIRST TWO SENTENCES OF FRG AMENDMENT (DISCUSSION OF
THIRD FRG SENTENCE REPORTED BELOW), BELGIAN REP SUGGESTED
THE FOLLOWING AMENDED VERSION OF THE FRG AMENDMENT AS A
COMPROMISE.

16. BEGIN BELGIAN TEXT

THEY SHOULD STATE THAT THE ALLIES CONTINUE TO CONCENTRATE
IN THE NEGOTIATIONS ON REDUCING THE LARGEST AND MOST SIGNIFICANT
MILITARY ELEMENT AND THE MAJOR DESTABILIZING FACTOR IN THE
AREA OF REDUCTIONS, I.E. THE EXISTING DISPARITIES IN GROUND
FORCE MANPOWER AND MAIN BATTLE TANKS. THEY SHOULD EMPHASIZE
THAT ALTHOUGH THIS NEW ALLIED MOVE TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION
EASTERN CONCERNS REGARDING NUCLEAR AND AIR ELEMENTS, THIS
EXCHANGE WOULD CONSTITUTE A UNIQUE OFFER, AND IS NOT BEING
PUT FORWARD AS A STEP TOWARDS FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR
OR AIR FORCES OR IN EQUIPMENT.

END BELGIAN TEXT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03753 03 OF 03 151711Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 ERDE-00 /083 W

----- 062514

O R 151545Z JUL 75 ZFF-4
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2716
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 3753

17. US REP OPPOSED THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE FRG AMENDMENT. HE POINTED OUT THAT THIS WAS IDENTICAL WITH THE OLD "PLUS" PARAGRAPH ORIGINALLY SUGGESTED BY BELGIUM AND APPEARING IN THE JULY 2 VERSION OF THE IS DRAFT GUIDANCE. HE SAID THAT RE-INTRODUCTION OF THIS PARA BY FRG REP DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE COMPROMISE AT THE JULY 7 SPC MEETING, WHICH CAUSED THIS PARA TO BE DROPPED FROM THE PRESENT VERSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, IN RETURN FOR THE PRESENT WORDING OF THE LAST PHRASE OF THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE THE PRESENT DRAFT GUIDANCE ("AND THAT IT IS NOT BEING PUT FORWARD AS A STEP TOWARDS FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN NUCLEAR OR AIR FORCES OR IN EQUIPMENT"). HE NOTED THAT SPC HAD ALSO AGREED AT JULY 7 MEETING THAT SOMETHING COULD BE SAID ON THIS MATTER IN THE SUPPLEMENT ON ADDITIONAL ASPECTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT ALTHOUGH HE WAS THE AUTHOR OF THE "PLUS" PARAGRAPH, HE FULLY SUPPORTED THE COMPROMISE AT THE JULY 7 MEETING, AND THEREFORE DID NOT FAVOR THE FRG REQUEST TO RE-INTRODUCE THAT SENTENCE. NETHERLANDS, AND CANADIAN REPS AGREED.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03753 03 OF 03 151711Z

FRG REP SAID FRG MIGHT CONSIDER MAKING ITS POINT IN THE SUPPLEMENT.

18. COMMENT: WE DOUBT THAT SPC CAN DO MUCH MORE WITH PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE UNTIL WE HAVE CLEARER STATEMENT OF FRG POSITION REGARDING FIXING OF NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING IN PHASE I OR PHASE II. IN THIS RESPECT, IT IS WORTH NOTING THAT NOW FRG, CANADA AND BELGIUM ALL HAVE DOUBTS ABOUT FIXING NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING, PENDING FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF DATA AND DEFINITION DISCUSSION IN VIENNA. WE HAVE NOT USED THE DATA AND DEFINITION DISCUSSION AS A REASON FOR DEFERRING AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST ON A NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING UNTIL PAHSE II. WE WOULD APPRECIATE BRIEF STATEMENT ON HOW WASHINGTON SEES RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DATA AND DEFINITION DISCUSSION IN VIENNA AND THE FIXING OF NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING.

19. THE SPC DISCUSSION ON PARA 3 DEMONSTRATED CONTINUED, FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE ON RATIONALE. FRG, BELGIUM, CANADA, UK AND ITALIAN REPS DISAGREE WITH REFERENCE TO EXPRESSED

CONCERN ON BOTH SIDES, AS CONTAINED IN US AMENDMENT, AND DISAGREE WITH THE RATIONALE THEY SEE IT REPRESENTING, I.E. TRADE OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS FOR GROUND FORCES. THEY SEE THIS RATIONALE AS AN ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE EAST TO EXPRESS FURTHER CONCERNS, AND TO SEEK TO INTRODUCE ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT IN THE NEGOTIATION, RATHER THAN AS A BARRIER TO INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE FOR SPC TO AGREE AT THIS TIME TO AS EXPLICIT A STATEMENT OF THE US RATIONALE AS CONTAINED IN THE US AMENDMENT. WE BELIEVE THE US HAS THREE ALTERNATIVES. ONE IS TO PROVIDE MORE EXTENSIVE EXPLANATION OF OUR RATIONALE. ANOTHER IS TO LEAVE THE US AMENDMENT OF PARA 3 IN BRACKETS, AND RETURN TO IT AFTER THE SPC IS FURTHER INTO A DISCUSSION OF CEILINGS QUESTIONS. THE THIRD IS TO WORK WITH A LESS EXPLICIT STATEMENT OF THIS RATIONALE (SUCH AS THE JULY 7 SPC DRAFT, OR THE

BELGIAN AMENDMENT ABOVE). WE WOULD SUGGEST LATTER COURSE. THE JULY 7 SPC DRAFT AND THE BELGIAN AMENDMENT OF THE "THEY SHOULD STATE" SECTION BOTH REFER TO EASTERN CONCERNS, AND BOTH REFER TO DISPARITY IN GROUND MANPOWER AND TANKS AS MAJOR DESTABILIZING FACTOR. JULY 7 SPC DRAFT IS BETTER THAN BELGIAN AMENDMENT IN ALSO REFERRING TO "UNIQUE TRADE" RATHER THAN "UNIQUE OFFER," BUT WITH THIS CHANGE THE BELGIAN
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03753 03 OF 03 151711Z

AMENDMENT MIGHT ALSO BE ACCEPTABLE. END COMMENT.

20. ACTION REQUESTED: IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, JULY 17, IF POSSIBLE: 1) BRIEF STATEMENT ON HOW WASHINGTON SEES RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DATA/DEFINITION DISCUSSION IN VIENNA AND FIXING OF NUMERICAL COMMON CEILING; 2) WASHINGTON VIEWS ON NEXT STEPS ON PARA 3 IN LIGHT OF COMMENT IN PRECEDING PARAGRAPH; AND 3) DID US HAVE ANY PARTICULAR REASON FOR REVERSING THE ORDER OF "AIR AND NUCLEAR" IN ITS AMENDMENT OF PARA 3 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE (IN ANSWER TO QUESTIONS WE SAID WE WERE UNAWARE OF ANY PARTICULAR REASON)? BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 15 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO003753
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzlaj.tel
Line Count: 364
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) USNATO 3614 DTG 071850Z JUL 75 (B) STATE 161503 (C) USNATO 3560 DTG 031310Z JUL 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JULY 14
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006